

7th February 1924]

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the amendments to sub-rules (4) and (5) of rule 39 of Order No. XXI of the First Schedule of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, issued by the High Court with the previous sanction of the Governor in Council and notified on page 1766 of Part II of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated the 25th September 1923.

Additional District Court, East Tanjore.

235 Q.—Mr. C. MARUTHAVANAM PILLAI: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) what is the exact amount of annual charges incurred by the Government in connexion with the maintenance of an additional District Court for East Tanjore at Negapatam;

(b) whether the pressure of litigation in Tanjore district necessitates the existence of this court; and

(c) whether the Government mean to give effect to the recommendation of the Retrenchment Committee with regard to the immediate abolition of the said court?

A.—(a) The Government are not in possession of the exact amount of annual charges. The expenditure based on the average cost is Rs. 48,568 per year.

(b) Yes; the court has been sanctioned for a year from 1st January 1924.

(c) No.

Appointment of Nadars in the Judicial service.

236 Q.—Mr. P. K. S. A. ARUMUGA NADAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state whether Nadars have been appointed as District Munsifs, Sub-Judges and District Judges?

A.—There are no Nadar Sub-Judges or District Munsifs at present. Information as to whether there were any Nadar Sub-Judges or Munsifs in the past is not readily available.

Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR:—“May I ask, Sir, whether the Government will consider the question of appointing one Nadar at least in the Judicial service?”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—“Mr. President, I should rejoice to see if a Nadar could be appointed in the Judicial service, but District Munsifs are recruited by the High Court. If there is any Nadar gentleman qualified for the post of either a Sub-Judge or a District Judge, I shall only be too glad to recommend to His Excellency for the necessary appointment.”

Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR:—“Has there been any petition with regard to any District Judge's post?”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—“I think on an average the Government have received five petitions from various communities that District Judges may be appointed from each particular community.”

[7th February 1924]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Honourable Members are aware that it is now 12 o'clock, and out of the 66 pages of questions and answers, we have reached only the 20th page. Standing Order No. 8 is to the effect that the first hour of every sitting shall be available for the asking and answering of questions. I take it to mean, unless the hon. the Law Member or anybody else is of the contrary opinion, that more time may be made available, and I propose to go on with questions and answers.”

Execution of decrees time-barred on account of the Mappilla rebellion.

237 Q.—Mr. V. MADHAVA RAJA : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state the action taken by the Government to redress the loss caused to parties in the affected area in Malabar in cases where the execution of civil decrees became time-barred during the late rebellion ?

A.—No such case has been brought to the notice of the Government.

Companies.

Joint Stock Companies.

238 Q.—Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTIYAR : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state the number of Joint Stock Companies which came into existence in the Presidency during the last five years and how many of these and the old ones were wound up during the said period ?

A.—The hon. Member is referred to the annual administration reports on the working of the Indian Companies Act, 1913, placed on the Editors' Table.

Criminal Justice.

The Imperial Bank fraud case.

239 Q.—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased—

(a) to place all the papers connected with the appointment by the Government of the Advocate-General and of Mr. Nugent Grant to conduct the Imperial Bank fraud case, on the table ; or

(b) to state all the facts connected therewith ?

239-A Q.—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Crown Prosecutor was asked in the usual course to conduct the Imperial Bank fraud case and he declined, and, if so, for what reasons ; and

(b) whether those reasons were considered satisfactory by the Government ?

239-B Q.—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is not true that Mr. Nugent Grant saw him in connexion with the Imperial Bank fraud case before the papers had come up to him officially, and he promised to appoint him as Special Public Prosecutor ;